

## REMARKS

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 5 and added new claim 16, which find support, for example, at page 3, lines 24-29, of the specification.

Claims 1-8 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0047210 (Yamada) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,894,386 (Poo).

In the Response Under 37 CFR 1.116 filed January 23, 2006, applicants explained that Poo's passivation layer 320, which the Examiner equated to the adhesive layer of claim 1, cannot function as an adhesive layer because it is exposed to cutting debris and the cutting liquid while Poo's wafer is diced along saw street 305 using cutter 325. In the Advisory Action mailed February 9, 2006, the Examiner does not agree with applicants because "Claims 1-8 are held *prima facie* obvious over the applied references due to the reasons of record." Applicants' argument in the Response filed January 23, 2006 did negate the alleged case of *prima facie* obviousness set forth by the Examiner in the Action mailed October 26, 2005. Applicants believe that the burden is now on the Examiner to come forward with different evidence of record to show otherwise.

However, solely to expedite prosecution, applicants have amended claim 1 to state that the supporting body does not cover any part of the back surface of the semiconductor substrate. Poo's encapsulant layer 340, which the Examiner equated to the claimed supporting body, needs to "surround the dies 301, 302" and thus covers the back surface of Poos' dies, as described at column 5, lines 61-64, and FIG. 3D of Poo, and contrary to the claim language. Poo requires this encapsulating structure because Poo's passivation layer 320 is not an adhesive layer and thus does not bond the encapsulant layer 34 to the front surface of Poo's dies, as explained above. Applicants note that Yamada's insulating layer 210, which the Examiner equated to the claimed supporting layer, also encapsulates Yamada's semiconductor substrate 202 and covers its back surface. Applicants note that this amendment does not change claim scope because original claim 1 inherently included the structure of the amended claim 1 as the claimed structure included the adhesive layer.

Claim 5 as amended recites the same supporting body as claim 1. The rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 USC 103(a) over Yamada and Poo should be withdrawn because Yamada and Poo together do not teach or suggest the claimed supporting substrate.

In light of the above, a Notice of Allowance is solicited.

In the event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorize the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952**, referencing Docket No. **606402017700**.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



---

Barry E. Bretschneider  
Registration No. 28,055

Morrison & Foerster LLP  
1650 Tysons Boulevard, Suite 300  
McLean, VA 22102-3915  
Telephone: (703) 760-7743  
Facsimile: (703) 760-7777

Dated: February 24, 2006